2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

241 177 not practical knowledge applied from our point of view; it must be from their point of view. Instruction must be articulated with their practices and techniques; it must take into account their arrangements and their rhythm of life. The knowledge imparted must be applicable to their conditions and be linked with the instruments at their disposal. For the dietician to extol the virtues of a new crop, for the doctor to show that bacteria more readily enter where resistance is lowered by deficiencies in food, even for the agricultural demonstrator using his superior implements to demonstrate the practicability of the crop—all this is very nearly fruitless. These things will have their value when they can be fitted into the Native's world of thought and technology. In the meanwhile, the execution of our plans, sound though they be in theory, is merely causing irritation and resistance.

241 476 178 All the old Lovedu cultivation was on the hills or along their slopes and, generally speaking, close relatives, not necessarily relatives through males, had all or some of their fields in large blocks (*demo*). Unlike the Tswana custom, these blocks stood in no relation to the social organization; the land was not pointed out by the chief and its size was not predetermined, but depended upon the energy of the individual cultivators. The *demo* was a matter of convenience and utility: the concentration facilitated co-operation in clearing the fields, economized the labour necessary for protecting the gardens, and made mutual assistance in hoeing and weeding much easier. No doubt the arrangements also mobilized incentives and added to the joys of life. There is to-day nothing left of these blocks. The old ones have inevitably fallen into the hands of more and more scattered people and no new ones can be created because large blocks of land are no longer available. The tendency towards dispersal and fragmentation was still further emphasized when Shangana-Ṭonga cultivation proved the fertility of the valleys. To-day a man must take land where he can find it, and though the Lovedu still live on the hills, they have their lands scattered all over the country. Indeed, since it is easier to plough on level ground, the hills are liable to be neglected, though wisdom dictates that it is best to have fields in two different environments. The result is that a man's fields are widely separated, sometimes being as far as ten miles apart.

241 462 The old division of labour in agriculture between the sexes was not uneven; both men and women hoed, weeded, and reaped. Only men cleared the forest, but against that only women cultivated certain crops, such as groundnuts. The old pattern is still more or less maintained, at least in principle. But cultivation by the plough has changed matters. Men look upon hoeing as the work of women, although the old ideal so much survives that they despise the Shangana-Ṭonga because their menfolk neither hoed nor weeded in the past. To-day hoeing and weeding among the Lovedu fall largely upon the women, and ploughing almost exclusively upon the men. This is not a fair division of labour; it might be fairer if the other activities of men, such as hunting and public life, had not become greatly attenuated. For the women are always busy, and their work is more monotonous than that of the men, who, despite the labour migration to the towns, have much more leisure than women.

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)19 3
FX14 Lovedu FX14

More thorough ploughing and a revival of the interest men used to have in agriculture would make the balance swing evenly. A man should not feel, as he tends to do to-day, that he pulls his full weight if he goes out periodically to earn wages, ploughs the fields, discusses cases, and builds huts. He has plenty of time to take a larger part in agriculture, as he did in the old days and as many of the older men still do.

Ploughing has brought about many other changes. It has necessitated clearing of the stumps and stones, and broken down to a large extent the old contour-terracing. This has accelerated erosion, which was in any case inevitable owing to the overstocking, just as overstocking is inevitable, not because men keep many cattle, but because of the density of the population. Erosion impoverishes the soil and over-use exhausts it. The result is that the initial benefits of the plough, which made larger gardens and better cultivation possible, are gradually being turned into liabilities. Every one will tell you that crops are more abundant to-day than in the old days; but the price is already heavy, and as the quality of the soil gets worse it will be increasingly heavier. Variety, the single-crop field, rotation of crops have gone. The planting season is much later and less concentrated in the months of October to December than in the old days, for ploughing is a rapid process as compared with hoeing, and one can avail oneself of good rains even as late as the middle of February. Late ploughing is not always deliberate; the small number of available ploughs and, more serious, the inadequacy of the draught animals, are equally responsible. The distribution of these resources is effected by various forms of co-operation, mostly partnerships in which one supplies labour, another the plough, and still another the cattle or donkeys. These partnerships, though patterned upon old forms of co-operation, have to take account of new factors, economic rather than social, and lead to new alinements in the society. Overstocking and ploughing have contributed to the silting up with useless sand of the old riverside gardens. Their original purpose, which was to tide men over the scarcity in the months November to February, partly fell away when ploughing brought a measure of abundance, but now that the old needs are reasserting themselves these gardens are destroyed. In their place the new Europeanized gardens, irrigated by furrows along the upper stretches of the smaller streams, have arisen, but the incentives that stimulate this new experiment are somewhat different: the gardens are for profit, not for providing an advance crop. The effects of ploughing may be pursued in many directions: it has emphasized the economic as against the purely social value of cattle, at the same time eliminating milk from the diet of adults; it has to some extent militated against husbanding the food resources; it has stimulated excessive drinking of beer; and it has released a large amount of energy for which there is little creative outlet.

For the present, agriculture is in unstable equilibrium. Every adult still has his own field, but the extreme limit of land available for cultivation has been reached. Limitation of stock can no longer ease the situation, as the chief evil is not overstocking but over-population. About 80 per cent. of the entire soil is arable land, at present or in the near past put under cultivation; as much as 80 per cent. of this land is

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

annually tilled, though the actual extent varies considerably according to the vagaries of the weather, the surplus in the granaries, the availability of implements and animals, and other factors. We do not think that in present conditions the absence of man-power in the towns is a material factor. On the contrary the man-power available is more than sufficient as long as present methods are employed. The introduction of the plough has liberated more energy than is absorbed by work among Europeans; the number of inactive men has increased rather than decreased. It is the shortage of animals and implements, rather than of men, that is most impressive. Even European labour and European ploughs and cattle are employed by the Natives; they come from the neighbouring farms and can do the work more economically than the Native with his inadequate resources. But it is not lack of human material, it is the impossibility of making the ploughs and animals go round, that necessitates such expedients. In the companies and partnerships, those who contribute the essentials, the cattle or the ploughs, are the dominant partners, and the others must often wait until late in the season before their needs can be attended to. The partnerships thus lead to tensions and strife, and hiring of services is becoming more popular. Yet on the whole the system works with remarkable smoothness. If it worked perfectly, the Natives would realize much more forcibly that it is not lack of industry that, as they think, is at the bottom of their troubles, but the inadequacy of the land and of their material resources.

Although animal husbandry ranks as a very poor second economic activity, it is still of sufficient importance to warrant a few remarks even in such a general account as this. Pastoral activities are not arduous; in the old days they were worthy of the metal of adult men who went armed to herd the cattle and supervised the milking. But to-day children herd and there are practically no cows to be milked. Cattle are individually owned both by men and women, but the kind of ownership, except in the case of some 15 per cent., is entirely different from what we understand by the word. For the vast majority of cattle are linked to the chain of *munyɔɔlo* (bride-price) exchanges and as such the individual's rights over them are subject to many restrictions. The primary value to the Natives of cattle is not economic, but social; he regards cattle as food only in the last resort, though there is no taboo against killing them. Cattle are not killed as sacrifices. Ownership of cattle is not the chief or even a very important method of reckoning status. A man will complain, not because he has no cattle, but because he cannot brew beer to maintain his prestige. The dung of cattle is used for smearing, cattle that die are eaten, and cattle are killed in time of starvation so that the meat can be exchanged for mealies. But cattle are, generally speaking, much too large units of value to be of use in economic exchanges. Finally, the needs of cattle do not determine the routine of the day. They are taken out late, after the dew has dried and the herdboys have had their morning meal; and they come back almost unnoticed without disturbing the arrangements of the village. In a sense, however, their needs set limits to the harvesting season; crops which are not reaped by the beginning of July are practically at their mercy. Yet, despite all this, cattle are regarded

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

CHAPTER IV

CO-OPERATION AND EXCHANGE

Arrangements of and changes in the work-party, partnerships, and solitary occupations—relative roles of economic and goodwill exchanges—beer, dances and bride-price as vehicles of reciprocal exchanges—aversion from business.

181 To convert to his use the material resources upon which man relies for subsistence, some organization of labour is necessary; man must co-ordinate his energies with those of his fellow man. He must co-operate with some and he may consider himself as a competitor of others. The Lovedu is an individualist, but life is hardly regarded as a competitive struggle, even in respect of the things that are limited in supply. Men aim, not so much at achievement and riches, as at maturity and self-sufficiency. There is no single scale of attainments by which men measure themselves against one another. Moderate success is credited to industry, but immoderate success may be suspect; he who reaps much more than his neighbours is in danger of being looked upon as an enemy in league with anti-social forces. The Lovedu do not display either their emotions or their possessions; ostentation is appropriate only to states of exhilaration. Self-expression finds its legitimate scope, not in worsting a rival, but in a gradually expanding responsibility and prestige. The society has a hierarchical framework so constructed that rank and age interpose themselves between possible competitors This does not mean that there is no competition, but the great emphasis is upon co-operation.

476 The two methods by which men pool their resources in order to provide for their primary needs are working together in mutual helpfulness and exchanging the products of their labour. Co-operative working together arises chiefly in agricultural and building activities, where its main purpose is easily intelligible; exchanges are not felt to bear such a direct relation to the differentiated needs and activities of men. Yet fundamentally co-operation and exchange are part of the same system of values. Mutual helpfulness is highly esteemed and aggressive exploitation deeply despised. In the co-operative situation these values are intrinsically present; but the exchange situation must be reconstituted to bring it into harmony with them. The problem in co-operative situations is to harmonize with them the individualism of the peasant; the problem of exchange situations is to eliminate the idea of a commercial transaction; and in both types of situations this is done by the stress upon reciprocity. The purely economic aspect tends to become wholly obscured, except in modern forms of co-operation and exchange. In them the helper becomes a servant and exchanges become 'bizmis' (business). Service and 'bizmis' are tolerated only so far as they conform to the old pattern and values.

476 571 The *lejema*, which is the most distinctive form of co-operative work, consists of a more or less casual group of workers. Neighbours, relatives,

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

and friends—indeed anyone—may join the group and help in the task, usually agricultural, which is being performed. But the group that collects for the occasion is not wholly fortuitous; relatives and neighbours always predominate. There is no elaborate pre-arrangement. The *lejema*-giver usually announces his *lejema* beforehand and invites some people to come. Women, who brew the beer, usually organize more than men, some of whom rely on those they can collect on their way down to the field that is to be hoed or weeded or reaped. People who are invited are not bound to give an excuse for not coming; it is far more usual to promise to come and not to come than to give an excuse which, whatever it is, can hardly be valid in a society where people are not considered to be bound by time or by their previous engagements. Moreover, the beer for the *lejema* may not yet have matured on the day fixed by the *lejema*-giver. People may have come from long distances, but they will not be annoyed; there is sure to be a beer party in progress quite near. On the other hand, the *lejema*-giver will not complain if those who promised to come do not put in an appearance, for he knows that since 'the far-off well causes thirst', it is better to drink by the way.

Often, though the beer may be ready, no work is possible on the day. The weather may be unpropitious, some important event may require rearrangement of the activities of the day, or sometimes work may be taboo because of a death or hail or the first rain after a period of drought. In these circumstances, the beer must nevertheless be consumed; it is not something that can await the convenience of man. And to those who partake, it is announced that the *lejema* has been converted into a *phɔdwa*—that is to say, the drinkers are not mere drinkers, but a potential labour force that may be expected to do a day's work at some future date. The arrangement is so vague that we cannot fit it into any of our conceptions, such as a promise to perform or a right to demand the labour. The *lejema*-giver may, if he has a good supply of corn, give beer again when he calls those who previously drank of the *phɔdwa*. A *phɔdwa* is essentially a pre-arranged *lejema* which has miscarried; but it may be fortuitous—for instance, when one has to kill a pig against which neighbours have complained. A social occasion at which one gives beer cannot be converted into a *phɔdwa*. Sometimes, when supplies are low or for other reasons no beer can be provided, a man invites a group of people to work for him in anticipation of a beer party, also called a *phɔdwa*, at a future date. But only very special circumstances justify these departures from the *lejema*.

According to our standards, activities at a *lejema* appear to be very haphazard and unorganized. Each member of the group contributes to one end, the execution of the task which is to benefit the *lejema*-giver; but the effort of each worker is not individually assessed; some may turn up when the work begins, others join in much later, even perhaps just before the workers prepare to go home. The work proceeds in a leisurely manner, without undue exertion; no special achievement is expected from any one and the organization is such that the most inexperienced and dilatory can keep pace with the most efficient. Efficiency is as little a matter for comment as inefficiency. There is no rivalry, no spirit of

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

476 571 461 calculation, no supervision. The adjustments in the situation rely upon no pre-organization; there is practically no leadership or direction; and yet an effective interaction is attained. The total pattern is a part of the social system; it is not as if two or more people have casually encountered one another and have by trial and error to discover how to co-operate effectively in performing the task. Christians, whose standards of organization, performance, and efficiency are derived from those of the white man, attempt to submit the workers to discipline. They sometimes constitute themselves as foremen, they attempt to apply the available energy systematically, they have a system of rewards and penalties. The result is, not co-operation, but service; there are few, if any, songs and the occasion is no longer a gala social event.

[184]

The workers at a *lejema* usually adjourn after one and a half or two hours to refresh themselves at about 11 a.m., when a pot of beer, euphemistically called 'the knife-sharpener', is brought to the field. The interval is of indefinite duration and is so much out of harmony with modern ideas, that 'the knife-sharpener' is often regarded with disfavour; instead of sharpening, it blunts the edge of activity in the modern situation, in which the *lejema*-giver thinks of himself as an employer and the workers are concerned to avoid being exploited. Neither employer nor employee is equipped by his background of culture and training to achieve success in these new roles; and the result is that tensions arise. Fortunately, however, the *lejema* is still overwhelmingly a collective social event. There is as yet no need to buoy up labour with dignity and moral worth; it is sufficient to submerge it in the sociability of beer. For the real nature of the *lejema* appears when the workers go to the home of the *lejema*-giver. The situation there instantly dispels any preconception we may have of special rewards for the workers. There are visitors, dubbed *vahobedi* (solicitants) and as such are distinguished from the *vashumi* (workers). In our society they would be called 'gate-crashers' or 'beggars', but they are not in needy circumstances and do not ask for favours; they are entitled to join in. Individually they not only imbibe calabash for calabash with the workers, but far outnumber them, not unusually by as much as four or five to one.

[574]

[735]

To judge the situation correctly, we must remember that begging, one of the traits of the Lovedu we might regard as most irritating, is not socially disapproved. He who has and does not give is the offender, not he who asks for what he needs. The case is different, however, when the beggar is a loafer and sponger, roaming about in search of beer without doing any work; and if, as is not unlikely, he is disliked, his presence during the exhilaration caused by the beer is liable to cause a breach of the peace and he might be turned away. Generally speaking, *vashumi* are not given special beer; the beer is not a reward for their services, but a feast transforming work into recreation and reflecting the emphasis upon liberality. To-day the *vahobedi* are sometimes looked upon as parasitic beggars, and measures are taken to reconstitute the *lejema* so as to make it a more economical method of co-operation. Fundamentally, all the arduous work is still done by *lejema*, though every one knows that, for, say, 4*s*. worth of salt, more workers could be obtained and better

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

work accomplished than if one had beer made at the cost of 10*s.* worth of corn, not to mention the time, labour, and firewood that is consumed in preparing the beer. The motive is, however, not economic but social. *Majema* are used, not for long and difficult tasks only, but also for light work, which a man can easily do himself without help. The aim in these cases is not so much to complete the work quickly—time is rarely a matter of importance—as to be credited with generous impulses and to have a pleasant social event. Christians, with their more Europeanized outlook, averse from the waste entailed, and fearing excommunication by the Church, which prohibits beer, nevertheless find it hard not to conform to this custom.

Another form of co-operation is the *khilɛbɛ* (*jɛbɛ*, a hoe). Uncommon to-day in its original form, it has its essentials preserved in ploughing partnerships, the so-called 'stock fair' in towns and particularly in the collective agricultural work of young girls. The co-operating group, defined by convenience and proximity of domicile, is largely a local one and consists mainly of close relatives, both on the mother's and on the father's side. The group is still comparatively stable, as it was in the old days, when it had its basis in common interests and common needs. Its members collectively reaped or weeded or hoed one another's fields, completing one field and then going to the next, and each arranged about his own food. Kin or neighbours had their lands closer together and less split up than to-day; they started their various tasks at much the same time; there was safety in concentration, and economy in co-operation. The great distinction between *khilɛbɛ* and *lejema* was and still is that no beer is provided; but, as in the *lejema*, the *khilɛbɛ* partnership lessened the monotony of arduous work and mobilized energies and incentives. As the group was smaller and more closely khit, relied more tangibly upon reciprocity and had more elements of continuity, the stimulus of beer was not necessary to hold it together. Each partner remained an individualist, for the crops were not shared; but each realized the value of mutual helpfulness and the necessity of minimizing the self in relation to the ends of others.

To-day the conditions of the operation of the *khilɛbɛ* no longer exist in their old form. Fields have become split up; the old dangers are no more; the plough has vastly decreased man's dependence upon the help of his kin or his neighbour. Though it was perhaps the most potent agent of destruction of the old *khilɛbɛ*, the plough has become the centre of the new. The household, which is the economic unit, hardly ever has ploughs, animals, and workers all available at the same time; only 30 per cent. of such units possess ploughs and only 15 per cent. have cattle or donkeys. Thus cultivation calls for some form of co-operation, and the form which was familiar was the *khilɛbɛ*. There are new elements in the situation, but their co-ordination was effected by drawing upon pre-existing patterns of co-operation. Typically the *khilɛbɛ* in ploughing consists of four partners, representing four economic units: one supplies the animals, a second the plough, the third some of the workers, and the fourth the herdboy, who looks after the cattle during the year and might wield the whip or plant behind the plough. The emphasis

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

is upon the sharing of tools rather than upon that sharing of services which characterized the old *khilɛbɛ*. But in the old institution hoes were borrowed from one another and the differentiation of to-day was not unknown, though it took a different form. The organization implies a person-to-person adjustment rather than institutionalized leadership, except that he who provides the animals sometimes tends to dictate whose lands have first to be ploughed. No payment passes, however unequal the contributions or needs of the partners, and sometimes an old widow is a partner who can contribute nothing at all. The essence of the whole institution is a complete disregard of the exact equivalences of the contributions or of the services.

This form of co-operation, in which mutual helpfulness and reciprocity and not economic advantage are stressed, finds expression in many activities. Among Christians there are potters who club together; usually they are kin who live in the same settlement. The only work they share is the excavation of the clay; each works quite independently of the other, though advice is exchanged. Men often build *ga khilɛbɛ* instead of *ga lejema*, but in this case the association is a very loose one, consisting merely of the available friends or relatives in or near the village; and though some small gift is given by the owner of the hut built, the main feature of the co-operation is a sense of mutuality and reciprocity. The conception of mutual helpfulness recedes before that of profit when, as is becoming more common, the person for whom the work is done pays a reward in money. Curious anomalies occur, because sometimes less, sometimes more, consideration is given to the exact money equivalence of the services rendered. Where a man considers that he is paying wages for services, he usually models his behaviour upon his conception of the European employer and the whole pattern of reciprocity falls to the ground. But this model is very unpopular, though for the employer it has distinct advantages; as he contracts for the labour, he can requisition it when he wants it and can control its execution. He is no longer an equal partner, but a foreman.

One development of the *khilɛbɛ* which is seen in townships is the 'stock fair'. It is practicable only where each of the partners periodically receives cash wages. Every month one of the partners, taken in rotation, is entitled to a fixed amount from each of the others, the purpose being to make available to every one in turn a fairly large sum of money. Though the partners wear some distinctive dress, the association is very unstable and many as a result suffer loss. The 'stock fair', far though it be removed from the *khilɛbɛ*, is thus based on a generalization from past experience in which social ends are attained by the application of rule-of-thumb principles, with little resort to trial and error and little dependence on organizing ability or on individual leadership.

With the various forms of co-operation, we may briefly contrast solitary occupations and services. It is somewhat unusual for any one alone to undertake a large task, and among heathens it is rarer still for an individual to hire out his services. There is no real domestic service; even in the royal household, *vulada* is very different from service in our sense of the term. The *mulada*, usually an orphan, is the ward of his

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

166 464 become to interpret economic forces as operating, not *in vacuo*, but against the whole background of social life.

182 157 It is likewise not economic forces alone, but the diffusion of a new outlook that has caused the major changes in the old co-operative system. Individual achievement was of little account; no one was penalized because he attained only a very indifferent standard of efficiency or industry; people were devoted to a non-material ideal. A man's whole upbringing and training conditioned him to the ideal of reciprocity and helpfulness. Yet in the modern world, where personal achievement is important and rivalries must necessarily arise, the life-adjustment value of this ideal is doubtful. To some extent, the individual adapts himself by accepting European standards when he is in town and relaxing from the strain when he has returned home. He comes back mentally tired, and it is recognized that he is entitled to take a long holiday, even though there is pressing work to be done. His failures in town are attributed, not to causes within himself, but to the operation of external forces. His dismissal is ascribed to the jealousy and witchcraft of a competitor for the same position, and the success of his rival to magic. Rivalry is an unfamiliar situation in economic activities at home, and the competitive, individualistic struggle in the towns is never phrased as being between members of the tribe; the magic that is used to oust him from competitive positions or to cause an employer to favour another is always magic used by members of another tribe, such as the Zulu or Xhosa. The Lovedu traditionally regard luck magic with some suspicion, at least as applied in economic situations. But it has become increasingly necessary in order to re-establish their sense of security; a whole new technique of charms, burning medicines to attract custom, chewing roots to give confidence (what the European might call 'effrontery'), and the like has developed. Many invoke, as before a dangerous enterprise in the old days, the blessing of the gods. Even within the tribal economy itself the spread of ideas of competition has been accompanied by the extension of magic and sorcery to new spheres of activity.

[789]

476 182 That this answer to contact with the new economy may not always suffice, we see among many neighbouring tribes—for instance, the people of Sekhopo, 'brothers' of the Lovedu. Among them beer, the quintessence of situations of reciprocity and co-operation, is converted into an article of sale. Beer is provided, even at *majema*, as wages, and hence only to the workers; visitors may join the beer-party, but must pay for each calabash they have. This commercialization is deplored by the Lovedu; it is regarded in the same light as charging strangers for board and lodging, a practice that prevails among highveld tribes; and it is almost as bad as what the Lovedu imagine to be the European custom of making relatives who come on a holiday pay their hosts. 'Our hotels are our relatives', said a Lovedu man to us; but while he was prepared to justify the commercial pattern in which salt, meat, tobacco, European vegetables, even money, oust beer in the *lejema*, the sale of beer seemed to him intolerable. This view fairly reflects the general opinion, as well as the attempt to harmonize the two patterns, among the Lovedu. Rewards are sometimes given to individual *lejema* workers, who are

2: Krige and Krige E-5 (1928-1939)1943
FX14 Lovedu FX14

paid in salt and the other commodities mentioned. But the practice is, except for payment in meat, largely confined to Christians. As far as it exists, it completely alters the old long-run reciprocity pattern. There is no social feast. Collective replaces co-operative activity; for personal profit, not sociability, is the prime motive; the social gala is converted into a labour situation, and the interests of employer and employee begin to diverge. Room for roundabout recipocity is narrowed; instead of the indefinite mutuality upon which a man who helps others to-day may rely in the future, he receives an immediate and individual reward; faith in long-range equivalence of services and obligations gives way to a desire for direct personal satisfaction.

To the new situation, in which the *lejema*-giver corrects and directs and the worker obeys and submits, imperfect adjustments have been made. Direction, hitherto unknown in the economic relations of equals, degenerates to exploitation; the answer to unwilling submission is resentment; and the employer is regarded as a renegade and cheat. He is known to buy a bag of salt for 7*s*.—and to distribute it so that each worker receives only one-sixth of the accepted value (1*s*.) of a day's work. The conflict, in which the worker retaliates by calling the employer 'unscrupulous', is only beginning. It may resolve itself by new adjustments, even though an aggravating feature is the fact that it is the Christian who is the budding capitalist and the pagan who is the dependent labourer. From the point of view of progress in agriculture, the danger is that employers are usually progressive, and progress thus comes to stand for anti-social methods. This hampers the work of agricultural demonstrators. It is clear that lasting solutions, even of apparently simple agricultural problems, not to speak of the complicated problems of administration or of wider spheres of culture contact, can be attained only by studying both the forms of the old institutions and psychological reactions among the people to the changes.

Turning to exchanges in the society—that is, purchases and sales, whether cash or kind is transferred—we may consider external and internal trade from the standpoint of whether it falls within a money, money-barter, barter, or gift-barter economy. We use these terms to designate the distinctions mentioned below. *External trade* refers to transactions with people belonging to groups outside or alien to the tribe, such as stores, farmers, and individuals of other tribes. *Internal trade* is largely local, but it may be interlocal when it occurs across the boundaries of the reserve, but between members of the tribe. *Gift barter* is reciprocal gift exchange. There is no exact economic equivalence. Mutuality, goodwill, and reciprocity are the primary considerations, but it is not the same as a gift, for a gift implies no return gift, but merely one-sided donations, such as presents to children. Out-and-out gift is *mpho* (from *hu fa*) and, while such gifts imply indirect mutuality, there is no expectation of a return gift. For our present purposes and in the table given below, they are left out of consideration; it would, for instance, be impracticable to distinguish between feeding one's household and giving them presents. From gift barter must be distinguished *pure barter*, in which the aim is an interchange of goods of equivalent value

4: Krige and Krige Σ-5 (1928-1939)1954
FX14 Lovedu FX14

231 creating and maintaining the all-important social relationships and realignments in the social structure that arise from marriage. Cattle are not 'gods with the wet nose' as among Tswana, but they may be dedicated to the ancestor spirits.

433 556 The economy is largely a subsistence one. A man should have enough for his family's needs as well as to entertain friends and neighbours with beer to maintain his good name and reputation for liberality, and to fulfil his kinship obligations. But accumulation of goods is frowned upon: in any case, in the absence of markets or methods of preservation of the crops, an 436 economic incentive is lacking. Payment for most services, even that of a 431 doctor, is made in beer. Exchanges on the whole are usually not motivated by differential needs but by goodwill, the obligations of kinship, and the 476 general emphasis upon long-run reciprocity; they are for the most part not business transactions but gift exchanges. Kin and neighbours co-operate in work parties for weeding, reaping, building. Helpers are honoured as workers (*vashumi*) and treated to beer at the end of the day, yet they cannot be said to receive any specific reward, for the gate-crashers (*vahobedi* or beggars), who join the party when it repairs to the home of the host for beer, drink calabash for calabash with the workers. In ploughing partnerships, in which each of the parties contributes his services or some commodity, there is complete disregard of equivalence between what is contributed by a partner and the service he is entitled to. Reciprocity operates through the instrumentality of economic goods, but it owes its significance as a moral force to the interdependences that arise from the social and political structure.

612 The society is patrilineal and marriage patrilocal, but cognates, agnates, and affines are not segregated into distinctive groups; each category overlaps to such an extent with the others, through cross-cousin marriage and other factors, that both structurally and functionally it is the bilateral kin-groups that are significant.

582 583 604 One of the basic features of the social system is the linking of brother and sister whereby the cattle (*munywalo*) coming in from the marriage of a sister are allocated to her brother to enable him to marry a wife. This cattle-linking of brother and sister is co-ordinated with cross-cousin marriage and an alignment of lineages into wife-providers and wife-receivers. That a man is expected to marry where his father has married or, more accurately, where his mother's marriage cattle have been used to establish a 'home', is the inevitable consequence, according to Lovedu conceptions, of the right of a sister to her cattle-linked brother's daughter as a daughter-in-law, who will cook and stamp for her and care for her in her old age. The arrangement implies that this girl should marry the son of the cattle-linked sister [588] of her father, but should there be no such son her paternal aunt may nevertheless 'marry' her, in which case she will bear children by some person appointed by the aunt to act for her non-existent son or 'pick them up' as she wishes.

The lineage has no distinguishing name, the term mokoko or
613 *leloko* which is in common use referring to the group of agnates
[602] as well as to the relatives on the mother's side of the family.
The lineage segment of four to five generations tracing its
[789] descent from a common male ancestor (grandfather of the adult males) shares a common major shrine and occasionally meets at the harvest thanksgiving or when a *mokhobo* (a gathering of the descendants of a particular common ancestor) is indicated by the diviner as the wish of a troublesome spirit.
[592] Such a group of agnates of four to five generations in depth tends to be concentrated in the same locality and in many cases
[476] may be found in the same homestead (*motse*). As neighbours and relatives they share in many common activities such as helping in each other's work-parties, taking part in girls' puberty ceremonies, consulting each other in the marriage of their sons and daughters. Only in the minimal lineage of father and sons are there jural ties. The lineage is not a land-owning unit, has no political functions, is not exogamous, marriage within the lineage being common especially in the Lobedu royal group.

[562] An interesting feature of the Lobedu lineage is the important part played by its women who continue even after marriage to be active in lineage affairs as leaders in religious ritual and as
[582] guardians over their brothers' households. The merging of the
[769] ancestors on the father's and mother's side of the family which results from preferential marriage with the mother's uterine brother's daughter and the inclusion in ancestor worship of relatives on both sides, which will be described later, also affect
613 the character of the lineage. A religious gathering (*mokhobo*) of
769 the descendants of Sekhobo which I attended showed the lineage segment of five generations in operation and illustrated
[602] some of these points. Descendants through both sons and daughters in the line of Sekhobo's chief wife took part in the ceremony and, in addition to calling upon the deceased father and other male ascendants of the head of the lineage, the officiator mentioned by name also the deceased father's uterine sisters and the father's mother. The inclusion of the father's mother was all the more remarkable because this was a gathering of the descendants of Sekhobo and it had been the specific complaint of the troubling ancestor that every year harvest beer was being offered to the spirits on the father's mother's

5:Krige E-5 (1936-1938,1961-1962)1964
FX14 Lovedu FX14

ance against future want by building up relations of friendship and goodwill with kin and neighbours whom you can call upon for assistance in time of need. Nor does property, as in Western society, command the services of others to any appreciable extent. The core of helpers in a work-party are there primarily because of ties of kinship and neighbourhood; the beer that is served may be enjoyed by any passer-by who wishes to join in. Traditionally, then, property is of value to the Lobedu only in so far as it can be consumed or meets an immediate need on the one hand or, on the other, is used for creating and maintaining social relationships. This is changing now under conditions of culture contact but the change is still largely confined to Christians.

There is not a great deal of exchange and what there is takes the form most frequently of gift exchange[1]. Property in the form of a gift is a tangible sign of a social relationship. A new bride speaks to no one in her new homestead until given a small gift in token of her new social relationship to the giver and the same holds for a newly-initiated boy or girl. Ties with one's maternal kin and with affines are also kept alive by gifts and gift-exchange. It is significant that agnatic ties are the only ones that do not require continuous gift-exchange. Yet even here a service rendered seldom goes unrewarded. Property and human relationships are, then, closely interlinked. That it is not possible always to separate economic and social relationship among the Lobedu is shown by the following examples. Just after the 1895 rinderpest Khidima, a royal relative, went to the queen, who is traditionally responsible for giving succour to orphans and the needy, to ask for money to buy mealies. She gave him some. A few years later he sent a messenger to her to say he 'had a baby daughter'. The queen accepted the gift and when the girl reached puberty presented her with a *thari* goat according to custom. Cattle followed and the girl, Myakwane, was duly 'married' by the queen. This was the beginning of a permanent bride-giving-bride-receiving relationship, for in 1950 the queen sent a messenger to the widow of Myakwane's brother who had used his sister's cattle, to ask for her daughter in marriage. *'Ge loda dikhomo tja ka. Ge nyaga mosadi a de a nthsidela*—I am following the tracks of my cattle.

[1] Krige, E. J., 1941.

5:Krige E-5 (1936-1938, 1961-1962) 1964
FX14 Lovedu FX14

was related to all except homesteads 10, 11 and 12: a sister of the head of homestead 1 was married in No. 13; a son in No. 4 of this cluster had married a Porcupine woman in No. 5; they had a distant mother's brother's son in No. 9 and they were related in the same way to two wives in the Pig group.

The Porcupine brothers for their part had a sister married in homestead 4 (Crocodile) and a daughter-in-law from No. 9. They therefore had affinal bonds also with two wives in the Pig group, sisters of this daughter-in-law.

The Pig group had married women from No. 9 and therefore had links also with No. 9's cross-cousins in the Crocodile cluster and with No. 9's affines, the Porcupines.

The manner in which kin of various kinds co-operate with each other and with neighbours could be seen very clearly when Enoch, head of homestead No. 9 had to meet a gift-exchange obligation involving the sending of beer to the head of a neighbouring district. The beer, made from mealies from Enoch's own fields was brewed by his mother and by his sister from homestead No. 8. When it was ready, a messenger was sent to notify (*rapa*) all their relatives (*moloko*). Calabashes for carrying the beer were borrowed from the neighbourhood and early in the afternoon a collection of women and a few men foregathered in the courtyard of Enoch's mother. There were ten calabashes and one petrol tin of beer, six baskets of Kaffir-corn and three half-filled enamel basins of grain into which the calabashes of beer were put for carrying. The grain was contributed by kin—by the cross-cousin in homestead No. 1; by the husbands (*baduhulu*) of the two sisters in homesteads Nos. 6 and 8; by two father's sister's daughters living outside the area and by a sister of the 'wife' of his mother, also outside the area, all of whom were present for the occasion. Women from the whole neighbourhood turned out to carry the beer. After the eldest sister of Enoch had poured a little beer on the ground with a prayer for luck on the journey and had drawn a magic circle round the mouth of each calabash with a charm, the party set out with ululations of joy and much talking and noise. Kin of all kinds and neighbours all contributed to the success of the enterprise and all took part in the feasting at their destination where the beer was consumed and a beast slaughtered for their entertainment.